

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/952,741	HATADA ET AL.	

Examiner	Art Unit	
Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD	1652	

All Participants:

Status of Application: 71

(1) Elizabeth Slobodyansky, PhD.

(3) _____.

(2) John Bailey (attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 January 2005

Time: 2:00 PM

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

NONE

Claims discussed:

NONE

Prior art documents discussed:

NONE


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner telephoned Mr. Bailey to discuss the allowable subject matter. Mr. Bailey requested to present the suggested claims in writing. The suggested claims are provided in the Office action. The examiner notes that the currently claimed amylase has the amino acid sequence that differs from SEQ ID NO:2 by a single amino acid. Such change most likely will not change any properties recited in claims 29-33 and the recitation of them does not present the claimed invention in a better form.